United Nations DP/2015/16

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services

Distr.: General
13 March 2015

Original: English

Annual session 2015
1 to 12 June 2015, New York
Item 6 of the provisional agenda
Evaluation

Annual report on evaluation, 2014

Summary

This report summarizes the key elements of the annual report on evaluation 2014, and provides a brief overview of the progress UNDP and its associated funds and programmes have made in fulfilling the evaluation functions outlined in the UNDP evaluation policy. It also presents the planned programme of work for 2015 and 2016. The full annual report on evaluation, with detailed analysis of results, will be submitted to the Executive Board in advance of the annual session of 2015.

Elements of a decision

The Executive Board may wish to: (a) take note of this summary and the full annual report; (b) request UNDP, the United Nations Capital Development Fund and United Nations Volunteers to address the issues raised; and (c) approve their programmes of work for 2015 and their proposed programmes of work for 2016.

Contents

Chapter *Page*

I. Introduction 2
II. Budget and human resources 2
III. Activities in 2014 3
IV. Decentralized evaluation 6
V. Evaluation planning, 2015-2016 7
VI. Evaluation activities of the United Nations Capital Development Fund 9
VII. Evaluation activities of the United Nations Volunteers 10

15-03949 (E) 190315

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The present report summarizes the 2014 annual report on evaluation. It assesses the progress made by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and the evaluation units of UNDP associated funds and programmes - the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) and United Nations Volunteers (UNV) - in fulfilling the evaluation function outlined in the UNDP evaluation policy.

2. Following the practice begun in 2013, the Independent Evaluation Office prepared a full annual report on evaluation for 2014, providing a more detailed description of evaluation and its related activities carried out in 2014. The full report will be available prior to the annual session of the Board.

3. The Independent Evaluation Office prepared the annual report on evaluation 2014 during a significant transition period for UNDP evaluations overall. The Office was revising the UNDP evaluation policy, which an independent expert group had reviewed in 2014. This entailed revisiting and reformulating a number of policy areas, including determining how to improve the decentralized evaluation system. The assessment of decentralized evaluations was not included in this annual report, following the Independent Evaluation Office's suspension of the quality assessment system while commencing a comprehensive examination of the system.

II. Budget and human resources

4. In 2014, Independent Evaluation Office expenditures for evaluations and other corporate-related activities totalled $8.06 million, of which $7.46 million came from regular (core) resources and $602,921 from other (non-core) resources. The Office was able to achieve a close to full utilization of its core budget (98 per cent of its core funding), a further improvement from the previous year (90 per cent). The overall expenditure decreased by 3.5 per cent from 2013, owing primarily to a reduction of 5.3 per cent in the allocation of regular funding and the adjustment in the timing of some project activities. The Office spent most (84 per cent) of its total general operating expenses of $3,632,238 on conducting evaluations and activities directly related to evaluations.

5. As of January 2015, the Independent Evaluation Office has 21 staff members, including 15 international professionals and six general service staff. As a result of professional mobility, the Office did not fill all professional positions in 2014, a situation that put a heavier workload on existing staff and affected the timeliness of deliverables in some cases. A total of 226 consultants were recruited in 2014 to support the Office's work in conducting evaluations and other activities.

6. The Independent Evaluation Office continued to ensure gender parity in 2014. Women made up 60 per cent of international professional posts (nine) and all of general service staff (six). Among the consultants recruited, 52 per cent (117) were female, similar to the 2013 figure. The Office's commitment to work with national consultants to the extent possible in conducting its evaluations remained strong. Of seven evaluations completed in 2014, all except one thematic evaluation[1] relied on support from national consultants, providing valuable insights into the countries under review and offering critical assessments based on the local context.

7. The Office is committed to promoting its staff's development. Currently, staff devote 5 per cent of their time to individual learning, using internally or externally available learning material and courses. In 2014, the Office began a professional development project that involved seeking experts and practitioners to work with in order to sharpen staff professional skills and competencies.

[1] Evaluation of the contribution of UNDP human development reports.

III. Activities in 2014

8. The Independent Evaluation Office programme of work is developed within the framework of the medium-term evaluation plan, 2014-2017, which the Executive Board approved in January 2014. In line with the plan, only one evaluation was due to be presented to the Executive Board in 2014: the evaluation of the Global Environment Fund (GEF)/UNDP Small Grants Programme conducted jointly with the GEF Independent Evaluation Office. However, owing to a delayed process, the evaluation will be presented to the Board in September 2015. In addition, the Office has focused on three thematic evaluations that it will present to the Executive Board in the course of 2015, including:

(a) Evaluation of the contribution of UNDP human development reports;
(b) Evaluation of the role of UNDP in supporting national achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); and
(c) Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to gender equality.

9. In 2014, the Office also conducted or launched two independent evaluations that emphasize an impact approach:

(a) The impact of UNDP support to protected areas management; and
(b) The impact of UNDP support to mine action.

10. Country-level evaluations – or assessments of development results – examine UNDP country programmes in order to determine the level of the organization's contribution to development results at the country level. The Independent Evaluation Office conducted six country-level evaluations in 2014, covering Armenia, Malaysia, Somalia, Tanzania, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe. Four of them (Armenia, Malaysia, Uruguay and Zimbabwe) will be made available to the Executive Board in 2015 at the time of Board approval of the new country programme documents for those countries. The remaining (Somalia and Tanzania) will be submitted to the Executive Board in 2016 with their new country programmes.

Joint evaluations

11. The Independent Evaluation Office engaged in a wide range of joint evaluations in 2014:

(a) Evaluation of the Poverty-Environment Initiative, with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP);
(b) Evaluation of the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD), with UNEP and the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO);
(c) Evaluation of small grants programmes with the Global Environment Facility (GEF);
(d) Evaluation of the impact of UNDP GEF support to protected areas management with GEF;
(e) Evaluation of the Joint Programme on Gender Equality in the United Nations system, a joint effort of five United Nations organizations – United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), UNDP, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), UNFPA, and Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) – in partnership with the governments of Norway and Spain.

12. Lessons from these joint evaluations are discussed in the full annual report on evaluation.

Evaluation policy review

13. As custodian of the evaluation policy, the Executive Board has mandated that UNDP periodically facilitate an independent review of the relevance and effectiveness of the evaluation policy first endorsed in 2006. The Executive Board approved a revised evaluation policy in 2011 (DP/2011/3), based substantially on a review of the policy carried out in 2010 (DP/2010/16). The Board has requested that the Independent Evaluation Office periodically commission external

reviews of the evaluation policy so that it can revise the policy as necessary to strengthen the UNDP evaluation function. To that end, an evaluation policy review was carried out in 2014.

14. The Board formally considered a draft of the review report at its second regular session 2014, and the final review report at its first regular session 2015. The Board requested that the findings and recommendations in the review be taken into account when drafting the revised evaluation policy, which the Board will consider at its annual session 2015.

15. The evaluation policy review is the work of an external consulting firm (Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée), which the Board had requested and the Independent Evaluation Office commissioned. The Office's role in the review process was administrative, not substantive. The views expressed in the report are those of the consulting team. Both UNDP management and the Office issued responses to the review report.

16. The review assessed the performance of the UNDP evaluation function since 2011, the extent to which the organization has responded to the policy's requirements, and the status of policy implementation. It identified areas that require policy changes or management decisions to improve the evaluation function.

17. The review focused on three elements of the evaluation policy: (a) overall UNDP evaluation function; (b) independent evaluations; and (b) decentralized evaluations. Given reported recurring weaknesses in the coverage and quality of decentralized evaluations and the special interest of the Executive Board in this issue, the review paid particular attention to the third element, confirming the existence of weaknesses, exploring the reasons for them, and suggesting appropriate courses of action.

Progress on reforming assessment of development results methodology

18. The Independent Evaluation Office revised its assessment of development results methodology in 2014 in preparation for the start of a new round of assessments in 2015. The Office has been conducting these assessments since 2002 and over 90 have been completed to date. In recent years, a number of significant changes have taken place in the assessment of development results approach, including the use of the Office's staff members to lead evaluations rather than external consultants. This latest revision of the assessments' guidance and methods manual codifies recent process changes, and responds to concerns and suggestions from regional bureaux, country offices and other key stakeholders, whose views were captured through interviews and surveys during 2014. The revised guidance addresses, for instance, a frequent problem of limited national data, as well as the need to ensure that assessments consider results within the context of the current UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017.

Evaluation Advisory Panel

19. In 2014, members of the Evaluation Advisory Panel continued to support the activities of the Independent Evaluation Office. The Advisory Panel, established in 2013, is an independent external panel comprising an eminent group of eleven international experts in the areas of evaluation and development. The panel is tasked with providing critical guidance and intellectual insight into the work of the Office to help advance its strategic impact on the organization. During 2014, panel members were engaged to review and provide advice on a wide array of the Office's activities. Some of the key assignments the members undertook included:

(a) Critique and recommendations on the annual report on evaluation 2013;
(b) Review and comment on the evaluation policy review draft report;
(c) Critical review of inception reports and draft final reports of thematic evaluations;
(d) Methodological guidance to, and participation in, key events (workshops) during the course of thematic and country-level evaluations carried out by the Office;
(e) Support to strategic direction of the Office throughout the year; and
(f) Operational guidance on staff professionalization and capacity.

20. In order to benefit from the collective expertise of the group, the Evaluation Advisory Panel convened during the week of 20 October 2014. The panel received a general update on the Office's

activities and provided direct advice and guidance on its strategic directions and ongoing evaluations through individual and group sessions. The panel also had meetings with some Executive Board members and UNDP management. The panel serves an important role within the UNDP evaluation function, stimulating internal reflection at the Office and insights on ways to improve its evaluation work.

Support to regional and national evaluation capacity

21. The Independent Evaluation Office cooperates with UNDP programme units to assist countries on evaluation capacity development. For the Office, the main activity is managing a biennial international conference on national evaluation capacities. National evaluation capacities conferences provide a South-South forum for government officials from programme countries to discuss evaluation issues and consider lessons from other countries facing similar constraints.

22. In 2014, the support of the Independent Evaluation Office to national evaluation capacity development focused on facilitating the exchange and engagement of UNDP programmatic units with different national evaluation capacities participants and other interested parties to support the implementation of the 18 national evaluation capacities commitments developed at the 2013 national evaluation capacities conference in Brazil. The Office developed a partnership with the UNDP International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth to design, promote and facilitate the exchange of knowledge and to monitor the efforts and results of national governments and partners.

23. One of the most significant accomplishments in 2014 was the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) endorsement of 2015 as the International Year of Evaluation, or EvalYear. The United Nations General Assembly acknowledged EvalYear and the need for national evaluation capacity development through its resolution (A/RES/69/237), which advocated stronger evaluation functions at the United Nations. A torch signifying countries' commitment to strengthening national evaluation capacity will be symbolically passed onto international evaluation partners during various evaluation events around the globe in 2015. The Fourth Conference on National Evaluation Capacities planned in Thailand in October 2015 will also celebrate EvalYear and discuss priorities for a global evaluation agenda.

Support to United Nations Evaluation Group

24. In 2014, the Independent Evaluation Office continued to support the work of the UNEG, a voluntary professional association of over 45 United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agencies and affiliated organizations that aims to advance the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the work of the United Nations development system and achieve development results.

25. The Independent Evaluation Office support to UNEG in 2014 focused on implementation of the UNEG strategy, 2014-2019. In consultation with other organizations, the Office engaged in the development of its 2014-2015 workplan. The UNEG strategy, 2014-2019, has four strategic objectives aimed at assessing if: (a) evaluation functions and products of United Nations entities meet UNEG norms and standards for evaluation; (b) United Nations entities and partners use evaluation in support of accountability and programme learning; (c) evaluation informs United Nations system-wide initiatives and emerging demands; and (d) UNEG benefits from and contributes to an enhanced global evaluation profession.

26. UNEG activities, particularly those in which the Independent Evaluation Office was significantly engaged, include the Director of the Independent Evaluation Office serving as UNEG Vice-Chair for work related to strengthening evaluation functions. Under this subgroup, UNEG focused on three areas of work: professionalization of evaluation in the United Nations development system; peer reviews; and a review of UNEG norms and standards. Work on professionalization included review and update of the 2008 evaluation technical competency framework to provide options for UNEG members to enhance the professionalization of evaluation in the United Nations development system. Peer reviews – which provide professional, independent assessments of evaluation offices' independence and credibility as well as the utility of their evaluations – were conducted in three organizations: the World Food Programme (WFP), GEF, and UN-Women.

UNEG norms and standards were developed ten years ago in 2005, and will be reviewed in 2015 to determine whether updates are needed.

IV. Decentralized evaluation

27. Decentralized evaluations refer to all evaluations commissioned by UNDP programme units, as distinct from those conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office. As noted in the introduction, given the ongoing review of the decentralized evaluation system, the annual report 2014 does not include an assessment of the decentralized evaluations. Quality assessments will commence again in 2015.

Country office and bureau evaluation capacities

28. In 2014, 82 out of 136 country offices (60 per cent) reported having at least one dedicated monitoring and evaluation specialist. This represented an increase from 45 per cent reported in 2013. The increase was reported in all five regions. In particular, all country offices (100 per cent) in the Arab States region were reported as having at least one monitoring and evaluation specialist. All regions, except Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, indicated that 50 per cent or more of their country offices had a dedicated monitoring and evaluation specialist.

29. Since 2012, there has been a consistent increase in both the number of country offices with at least one monitoring and evaluation specialist and the number of monitoring and evaluation specialists in country offices. However, a distinction is not made between work on monitoring activities and on evaluation activities, so the actual level of evaluation capacity across country offices and regions remains difficult to assess. The independent review of the UNDP evaluation policy carried out in 2014 provided some estimates based on self-completion surveys and interviews.[2] Forty-three out of 228 UNDP monitoring and evaluation specialists contacted responded. Of those indicating they work full time on monitoring and evaluation, in their aggregate response they noted that they spent approximately one-third of their time on evaluation. For those who said they work on monitoring and evaluation part time, they estimated that approximately 10 per cent of their time was spent on evaluation. In addition, and importantly, just 12 per cent of the monitoring and evaluation respondents indicated they had received specialized training on evaluation.

Evaluations commissioned by country offices and regional and policy bureaux

30. In 2014, 102 country offices (75 per cent) commissioned a total of 244 evaluations: 20 outcome evaluations, 194 project evaluations, and 30 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and other programmatic evaluations. Of the 244 evaluations commissioned, 96 (39 per cent) focused on Global Environment Facility funded projects. GEF requires terminal (end of project) evaluations for all large and medium-size GEF projects that UNDP and other implementing organizations carry out.

31. The total volume of decentralized evaluations conducted across UNDP decreased by 18 per cent in 2014, compared to the same period in 2013, (244 versus 298 evaluations in 2013). This broke an upward trend since 2011 (226 in 2011; and 245 in 2012). All regions showed a decline, with the largest drop observed in the Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States region, with a decrease from 63 evaluations in 2013 to 38 in 2014 (a 40 per cent reduction), possibly reflecting the smaller number of project offices reporting in the region, as well as the general reduction in the number of project and outcome evaluations conducted with more UNDAF and other evaluations. Latin America and the Caribbean (20 per cent drop), Asia and the Pacific (15 per cent), Africa (9 per cent) and Arab States (7 per cent) followed this trend.

[2] Review of the UNDP evaluation policy, final report, 3 October 2014.

32. In 2014, UNDP regional and policy bureaux conducted a total of 11 evaluations. The Bureau for Policy and Programme Support completed three thematic evaluations and four global UNDP-GEF project evaluations. The remaining four evaluations in 2014 were carried out by the Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (three) and the Regional Bureau for Asian and the Pacific (one). No evaluations were conducted in 2014 by the Regional Bureau for Africa, Regional Bureau for Arab States, and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Evaluation plan compliance

33. In accordance with the UNDP evaluation policy, all evaluations included in evaluation plans are mandatory and require a management response. Of the 244 evaluations completed in 2014, 189 (77 per cent) had a management response, yielding 1,418 key follow-up actions. By the end of 2014, 21 per cent of the key actions had been completed, 78 per cent were ongoing, and one per cent was no longer applicable. It was noted that 20 per cent of the planned key actions had already passed the indicated due dates and 17 per cent did not have due dates clearly indicated.

34. Since 2011, country programme evaluation compliance has been measured at the end of the programme period and is based on completion of all planned evaluations during the period. Of 16 country programmes concluded in 2014, 11 (69 per cent) were fully compliant: 90 to 100 per cent of all planned evaluations were completed. Four (25 per cent) were partially compliant: 40 to 89 per cent of planned evaluations completed; and one (6 per cent) was not compliant: less than 39 per cent of evaluations completed. The 16 concluded country programmes had a total of 224 planned evaluations. Of 194 completed evaluations, 170 (88 per cent) included a management response as required by the evaluation policy.

V. Evaluation planning, 2015-2016

Programme of work for 2015

35. The programme of work for 2015 and 2016 is aligned with the Independent Evaluation Office medium-term evaluation plan, 2014-2017. In 2015 the following thematic evaluations will be presented to the Executive Board.

Executive Board session	Evaluations
Annual session June 2015	Evaluation of the contribution of UNDP global and regional human development reports
	Evaluation of the role of UNDP in supporting national achievement of the Millennium Development Goals
Second regular session September 2015	Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to gender equality
	The impact of UNDP support to protected areas management (joint evaluation with GEF)
	Evaluation of the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (joint evaluation with GEF)

36. The Independent Evaluation Office will conduct nine assessments of development results in 2015, covering Albania, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Mauritania, Morocco, Sao Tome and Principe, and Viet Nam. The reports will be made available to the Executive Board in 2016.

37. The Independent Evaluation Office will also support the Fourth Conference of National Evaluation Capacity.

38. Within the existing evaluation policy, the Independent Evaluation Office is responsible for preparing revisions in consultation with UNDP senior management and will present a revised policy to the Executive Board in at the annual session in 2015.

Programme of work for 2016

39. The proposed programme of work for 2016 is set out below; however, it may need adjusting depending on the expectations for the Independent Evaluation Office set out in the revised UNDP evaluation policy and the availability of resources. Nonetheless, the Office will continue with the evaluations it has committed to produce within the medium-term evaluation plan. In 2016 the following thematic evaluations will be presented to the Executive Board.

Executive Board session	Evaluations
First regular session January 2016	The impact of UNDP support to mine action
Second regular session September 2016	Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to anti-corruption and public integrity strategies
	Evaluation of the UNDP response in the immediate aftermath of crisis

40. 2016 will be an extremely busy year in conducting evaluations. In addition to completing those to be presented to the Executive Broad in 2016, there is a large number of evaluations of programmes aligned with the UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017, as well as an evaluation of the strategic plan itself, that need to be conducted in 2016 so as to feed into to preparations for the next strategic plan. Unlike assessments of development results, these other programme evaluations are presented to the Executive Board and include the following eight:

(a) Evaluations of the regional programmes (five);
(b) Evaluation of the global framework for policy support, 2014-2017;
(c) Evaluation of the UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017; and
(d) Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to South-South and triangular cooperation.

41. In addition, the Independent Evaluation Office will conduct two thematic evaluations that will be presented to the Executive Board at the first regular session 2017:

(a) Evaluation of UNDP support to disability-inclusive development. The evaluation will address the issue on two levels: (i) how UNDP is mainstreaming the rights and opportunities for persons with disabilities across its programme support work in countries; and (ii) results from direct support programing, for instance to landmine victims. The Independent Evaluation Office will consult with other United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies to consider carrying out this evaluation jointly; and
(b) Evaluation of institutional effectiveness, which will be jointly carried out by Independent Evaluation Office and UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations. It will focus on UNDP work at the country level. This theme relates directly to section five of the UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017.

42. The Independent Evaluation Office will conduct six assessments of development results in 2016, which will be made available to the Executive Board in 2017.

VI. Evaluation activities of the United Nations Capital Development Fund

43. UNCDF expenditure on evaluation in 2014 was approximately $580,000 drawn from core and non-core resources, including staffing costs of one evaluation specialist and one evaluation officer. During 2014, UNCDF completed one final evaluation assessing the performance of a support programme to decentralization, de-concentration and local economic development in Benin and began the following three others:

(a) Final evaluation of the YouthStart programme supporting the development of youth financial services in eight African countries;
(b) Mid-term evaluation of the expansion phase of the MicroLead programme supporting the introduction of savings-led models in the least developed countries; and
(c) Thematic evaluation of the performance of the UNCDF local development fund mechanism since 2005.

44. During 2014, UNCDF continued to make use of the UNDP management response system ensuring that all completed evaluations had accompanying management responses and that UNCDF continued to follow up on actions it committed to in previous evaluations. For example, in its response to a critical final evaluation of the Gender Equitable Local Development Programme in 2013, UNCDF has acknowledged the need to make use of a broader range of local finance instruments in the design of its successor joint programme, Inclusive and Equitable Local Development, with UN-Women and UNDP to support women's local economic empowerment. Similarly, the findings of an evaluation of a local development fund project in Liberia helped spur the introduction of a new monitoring system throughout the local development finance practice, which will include a new set of performance indicators to capture the results of the expanding range of public and private finance instruments being used. More importantly, the evaluation confirmed the rationale for local development finance practice to introduce a systemic approach to financing local investment projects for the private sector.

45. Regarding key evaluation results in 2014, the Benin evaluation praised the UNCDF intervention for having supported concrete improvements in the local government planning and management system. Mixed results were reported across investments funded in areas such as agricultural processing, small-scale village farms, and agricultural inputs to vulnerable families while the construction of agricultural warehouses to support the launch of a warehouse receipt instrument was judged to have contributed significantly to improved local agricultural value chains. The evaluators emphasised the need for better planning of investments overall in these types of projects, so that they are better linked into the functioning of agri-food systems at the local level.

46. Elsewhere, UNCDF interventions were well covered in a series of UNDP-managed evaluations. Key findings from the Independent Evaluation Office's thematic evaluation of the UNDP contribution to MDG achievement included praise for the UNCDF approach to working through decentralized institutions, validation that its support to local level planning constituted 'a pathway to impact in its own right'. The evaluators recommended that UNDP and UNCDF 'combine their efforts in a more proactive way' going forward, recognizing that 'UNCDF brings unique capacity and expertise on decentralization, while UNDP has better access at the upstream level in government'.

47. In an effort to strengthen its evaluation function, and in anticipation of a revised evaluation policy in 2015, UNCDF intends to revise the roles and responsibilities of its senior managers for evaluation, to rework mandatory criteria for evaluation to ensure a more representative sample of the organisation's work, and to seek guidance from the Independent Evaluation Office's Evaluation Advisory Panel on how evaluation practice should evolve in an organization with the size and mandate of UNCDF. In support of these initiatives, UNCDF plans in 2015 to draw up an evaluation strategy that will further operationalize its commitments to evaluation quality and coverage as set out in the UNCDF strategic framework, 2014-2017.

VII. Evaluation activities of the United Nations Volunteers

48. The UNV budget for evaluation in 2014 was $582,000, which represents a 42 per cent increase compared to 2013, drawn from core and non-core resources, including the Special Voluntary Fund.

49. The UNV strategic framework, 2014-2017, reflects a strong commitment to clearly demonstrating the contribution of volunteerism to the achievement of more effective peace and development results. UNV has initiated a dialogue with the Independent Evaluation Office and key United Nations partners on ways to best evaluate the contribution of volunteers and volunteerism to development programmes with a distinct focus on thematic and partner evaluations, while ensuring greater quality of decentralized evaluations. To this extent, UNV intends to collaborate with the Office in 2015 to further strengthen its evaluation function by leveraging the Office's technical capacity, operational independence and impartiality.

50. A major thematic evaluation completed and managed by UNV in 2014 was the summative evaluation of its contribution to national and regional volunteer infrastructures. This high-profile evaluation has served to guide the formulation of UNV new global programme on volunteer infrastructure. In addition, other major evaluations initiated include the evaluation of the contributions of the Online Volunteering Service and the mid-term evaluation of the UNV regional project "Arab Youth Volunteering for a Better Future".

51. In light of the commitment to strengthen its evaluation function, UNV has ensured that all of its new global programmes integrate a strong commitment to evaluation. Accordingly, UNV has allocated 5 per cent of each of its global progammes' budget lines – peacebuilding, youth, basic social services, community resilience for environment and disaster risk reduction, and volunteer infrastructure – to monitoring and evaluation.